UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,275	12/29/2000	Koichi Mori	04770.00004	6488

22907	7590	07/06/2004	

BANNER & WITCOFF
1001 G STREET N W
SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER
CHANG, JUNGWON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	6

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 April 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
    application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4,5*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-38 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-9, 11-18, 20-28 and 30-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Robotham et al. (US 6,704,024), hereinafter

Robotham, in view of Huang (US 6,496,600).

4.   As to claim 1, Robotham discloses the invention substantially as claimed

including a method for displaying content on a client terminal device (col. 5, lines

36-37), the method comprising steps of:

determining at a host terminal device (i.e., server; 22, fig. 2) for characters

forming the content (i.e., analyzing the characters forming the content; col. 1,

lines 59-66; col. 2, lines 20-21);

selecting a set of font images from a font library, the selected set of font

images having fewer font images than the font library (i.e., selecting font images

from a font library; col. 11, lines 43-47 and 55-57); and

sending the selected set of font images from the host terminal device (i.e.,

server; 22, fig. 2) to the client terminal (i.e., client, 24, fig. 1) over a

communication link (i.e., LAN, WAN, Internet; 18, fig. 1; col. 7, lines 30-48; col. 8,

lines 11-19) (i.e., transmitting the set of font images to the client terminal; col. 11,

lines 35-37 and 47-57).

5.   Robotham discloses a host terminal device that analyzes the

characteristics of forming the content (col. 1, lines 59-66; col. 2, lines 20-21).

However, Robotham does not specifically disclose a frequency of selected font

characteristics for characters forming the content. Huang discloses a frequency

of selected font characteristics for characters forming the content (i.e., analyzing

the frequency of the selected content to identify characteristics of font such as

font size, font style, or font color; col. 5, lines 1-13 and 44-55; col. 11, lines 38-

41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Robotham and Huang because

Huang's frequency of selected font characteristics would allow the host terminal

device to identify what font characteristics are used to form the web content.

6.   As to claims 2-5, Robotham discloses the communication link is a

computer network (i.e., LAN, WAN, Internet; col. 7, lines 30-48; col. 8, lines 11-

19), the Internet (i.e., Internet; col. 7, lines 30-34; col. 8, lines 17-19), wireless

communication system (i.e., personal area network (PAN); col. 8, lines 15-16),

and mobile communication network (i.e., wireless communication, personal area

network (PAN); col. 8, lines 15-16).

7.   As to claim 6, Robotham discloses receiving a request from the client

terminal device for the content (col. 17, lines 53-56; col. 19, lines 43-45).

8.   As to claims 7 and 9, Robotham discloses compressing the selected set of

font images before sending the selected set of font images to the client terminal

device (i.e., compression of the images; col. 9, lines 40-45; col. 12, lines 4-13);

and sending the compressed content to the client terminal device (i.e., client, 24,

fig. 1) over a communication link (i.e., LAN, WAN, Internet; 18, fig. 1; col. 7, lines

30-48; col. 8, lines 11-19) (i.e., transmitting the compressed content to the client;

col. 9, lines 40-45; col. 12, lines 4-13; col. 27, lines 7-12).

9.   As to claim 8, Robotham discloses content containing content location

information (i.e., URL, col. 5, lines 45-56). Huang discloses types of font and

character formation (i.e., font code represents a type of a font; col. 1, lines 52-58;

col. 2, lines 1-3; col. 5, lines 1-13). However, Robotham and Huang do not

specifically disclose font pattern codes for the content. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

include font pattern codes because it would indicate what type of font of a

character that is used in the content.

10.   As to claim 11, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 8

above. In addition, Robotham discloses receiving the selected set of font images at the client terminal device (i.e., transmitting the set of font images to the client terminal; col. 11, lines 35-37 and 47-57); receiving the selected content at the client terminal device (i.e., transmitting the selected content to the client terminal device; col. 9, lines 40-45; col. 12, lines 4-13; col. 27, lines 7-12); displaying the content at the client terminal device based on the selected set of font images (i.e., displaying the content on client terminal device; 5, fig. 1; col. 3, lines 5-15; col. 5, lines 36-37).

11.   As to claim 12, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, Robotham discloses displaying the content at the client terminal device based on the selected set of font images (i.e., displaying the content on client terminal device; 5, fig. 1; col. 3, lines 5-15; col. 5, lines 36-37; col. 8, lines 30-37); and content containing content location information (i.e., URL, col. 5, lines 45-56). Huang discloses types of font and character formation (i.e., font code represents a type of a font; col. 1, lines 52-58; col. 2, lines 1-3; col. 5, lines 1-13). However, Robotham and Huang do not specifically disclose font pattern codes for the content. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include font pattern codes because it would indicate what type of font of a character that is used in the content.

12.   As to claim 20, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1

above. In addition, Robotham discloses a memory storing a font library (i.e., font

libraries requires significant memory and is maintained on the server; col. 11,

lines 47-52).

13.   As to claim 31, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and

12 above. In addition, Robotham discloses a memory receiving a selected set of

font images (i.e., client memory for receiving a selected set of font images; 7, fig.

1; col. 11, lines 35-37 and 47-57); and a processor (i.e., processor, 3, fig. 1)

generating a display of the selected content based on the selected set of font

images (i.e., displaying the content on client terminal device; 5, fig. 1; col. 3, lines

5-15; col. 5, lines 36-37; col. 8, lines 30-37).

14.   Claims 13-16, 21-24 and 32-35 are rejected for the same reasons set forth

in claims 2-5 above.

15.   Claims 17, 18, 26, 28 and 36 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in

claims 7 and 9 above.

16.   Claim 25 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1 above.

17.   Claims 27, 30 and 37 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim

8 above.

18.   Claims 10, 19, 29 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Robotham et al. (US 6,704,024), Huang (US 6,496,600),

further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

19.   As to claims 10, 19, 29 and 38, Robotham and Huang do not specifically

disclose sending the content to the client terminal device is done on a page-by-

page basis. However, AAPA discloses sending (i.e., loading) the content page-

by-page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teachings of Robotham, Huang and

AAPA because AAPA's sending the content page-by-page would reduce

bandwidth instead of sending the entire content at a time.

Conclusion

20.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

Fletcher et al, patent 6,417,873, Bertram et al, patent 6,073,136, Mighdoll et al,

patent 6,073,168, Boguraev et al, patent 6,553,373, Schilit et al, patent

6,670,968 disclose method and system for identifying web page characteristics

such as font, style, and language.

21.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Jungwon Chang whose telephone number is

(703)305-9669. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 (Monday-

Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding

is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

JWC
June 18, 2004

ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER